



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,676	12/27/2001	Patricia A. Robinson	088305-0139	7052

7590 04/17/2006

William T. Ellis  
Foley & Lardner  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20007-5143

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,676

Applicant(s)

ROBINSON ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan-F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-43 have been examined.

### *Response to Amendment*

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 1/31/2006.
3. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-41, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dodrill et al ("Dodrill", US 6,901,431).

As per independent claim 1, Dodrill discloses a method for dynamically developing a user interface in an existing software application, comprising:  
invoking a user interface developer component during the execution of the software application from within the software application (Column 9 lines 25-48); identifying one

Art Unit: 2174

or more fields to include in the user interface (Column 10 lines 1-39); associating a field type for each of the identified one or more fields (Column 9 lines 9 line 53 – Column 10 line 39); associating the user interface with a function of the software application (Column 11 lines 1-11); saving the identified one or more fields and associated field types in a user interface definition file (Column 10 lines 40-49); and generating the user interface based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application (Column 11 lines 1-18).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Dodrill discloses a method, further comprising: providing one or more values for at least one of the identified one or more fields depending upon the associated field type (Column 9 line 53- Column 10 line 39); and saving the one or more values in the user interface definition file (Column 10 line 40-49).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Dodrill discloses a method, wherein the user interface definition file is saved as an XML file (Column 10 lines 40-49).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Dodrill teaches a method, wherein the generating includes parsing the user interface definition file to generate the user interface ([Column 9 line 53- Column 10 line 49).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Dodrill teaches a method, wherein the generating further includes transforming the parsed user interface definition file into one or more objects (Column 9 lines 1-67).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Dodrill teaches a method, wherein the generating further includes displaying the user interface based on the one or more objects (Column 10 lines 1-49).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Dodrill discloses a method, wherein the user interface developer component is implemented as a plug-in for the software application (Column 6 line 51- Column 7 line 16).

Claims 9,17,25,33 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10,18,26,34 are individually similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11,19,27,35 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12,20,28,36 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13,21,29,37 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15,23,31,39 are individually similar in scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16,24,32,40 are individually similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 1, Dodrill teaches a method wherein the associated function is triggered in response to an input received by the software application (Figure 4).

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 1, Dodrill teaches a method wherein the step of associating the user interface with a function includes receiving a selection of the function from a list of functions of the software application (Figure 4).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dodrill et al ("Dodrill", US 6,901,431).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Dodrill fails to distinctly point out a drop down menu. However, Official Notice is taken that selection from a drop down menu is well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Dodrill with the current teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a compact and flexible way of presenting elements.

9. Claims 6,14,22,30,38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dodrill et al ("Dodrill", US 6,901,431) in view of Lewallen ("Lewallen", US 6,801,224).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Dodrill fails to disclose the one or more objects being java. However, Lewallen teach a method, wherein the one or more

Art Unit: 2174

objects are Java (Column 8 lines 28-35; *converting interface to java*) (Column 7 lines 15-17). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the java objects of Lewallen with the method of Dodrill. Motivation to do so would have been to provide extensibility to run almost on any platform.

Claims 14,22,30,38 are individually similar in scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.



Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro  
Art Unit 2174  
Patent Examiner

RFP

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100